

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 to 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Whitman, et al., patent #6,772,150.

In the present application, failed search queries are analyzed in a self enhancing search system to improve results. This self-enhancement search system includes a search system log analyzer, which periodically looks through the search system log, of a database, for unsuccessful search queries that did not turn up a sufficient number of references or documents: a relevant document finder which, based on enhanced query terms and their categorization and subject, uncovers relevant documents that were not found by the unsuccessful search queries and a meta data enhancer, that enhances the textual index for the relevant documents based on the enhanced query terms in the search index, to allow the relevant documents turned up by the enhanced query to be returned when future searches similar to the unsuccessful search queries are entered by users.

Applicant's attorney did not find in the Whitman patent, column 10, line 60 to column 11 to line 8, where terms of unsatisfied search queries are added to documents missed by unsatisfactory search queries, but turned up by enhanced queries, as contended by the Examiner. From applicant's attorneys reading of the section, it deals with entries into the query log 137 not with the addition of unsatisfactory search terms to the documents missed by the unsatisfactory search queries but turned up by the modified search terms. The Whitman patent discusses successful searches and stores the most highly scored phrases for subsequent lookup (column 2, lines 28 to 40). In a number of places

the Whitman patent discloses ignoring unsuccessful searches (example, column 3, lines 52 to 57). In addition, the modification of queries is not automatic, as stated by the Examiner on page 6 of his action but involves user intervention “(e.g., one click of the mouse)” as stated on page 5 of the action.

As amended, all the claims in the application recite limitations that reflect the above described differences in the present application and the Whitman patent. For instance, independent claims 1 and 9 now call for the addition of unsuccessful search queries to documents missed by those queries but turned up by the enhanced queries. Further, all independent claims call for automatic searching using new keywords when the original search terms are used in future queries and call for an analyzer that selects unsatisfactory searches for analysis. Independent claims 9 and 17 recite unsatisfactory search results as those that cite less than a specified number of references.

The modification of the claims does not require the Examiner to consider any previously unconsidered material. The subject matter incorporated into the independent claims 1 and 9 came from cancelled dependent claims (2 and 3 and 10 and 11, respectively) which were previously considered by the Examiner. For these and other reasons, all claims in the application clearly distinguish over the prior art.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112

The applicant has modified the claims to overcome the deficiencies cited by the Examiner under 35 USC 112 and checked the claims for similar deficiencies.

Objections to the Claims

The errors mentioned in the rejection have been corrected. The applicant's attorney has gone over the claims for any other necessary corrections.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable, and therefore it is requested that the application be reconsidered, allowed and passed to issued.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



James E. Murray - Attorney

Registration No.: 20,915

Phone: (845) 462-4763